



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/878,193	06/12/2001	Yuji Sato	0717-0469P	1968

2292 7590 06/14/2005

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH  
PO BOX 747  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER
----------

FATAHI YAR, MAHMOUD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2674

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/878,193

Applicant(s)

SATO ET AL.

Examiner

Mike Fatahiyar

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The indicated allowability of claims 2-9, 11-12, 14-15, 17-18 and 20-21 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Ando(5,931,951). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Solhjell et al(5,375,245) in view of Ando(5,931,951).

Solhjell et al disclose an image display system comprising at least one display device(3) connected to a host device(1) wherein the display device displays an image in accordance with an image signal which is output from the host device. The display device(3) includes a synchronization pulse detector(4) for monitoring synchronization signals sent from the host(1). If the display system(3) detects no synchronization signal from the host(1) it automatically reduces power consumption. Solhjell et al substantially show all the features of the above claims except for the "at least one display device monitors a state of coupling with the host device", the "state of coupling with the host device is based on a supply voltage level of the host device", the "state of coupling with the host device is based on a data-enable signal output from the host device", the "state of coupling with host device is based on a data transfer clock signal". However, Ando is

Art Unit: 2674

cited to show that the concept of reducing power consumption of an LCD display device(503, 504) based on some sort of data signal(STPCLK) output from the host(11) when the system idle state is detected is old(column 13, lines 1-10 and 35-67; column 14, lines 47-67 and figure 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Solhjell et al with the noted teachings of Ando such that the display device(3) monitors the state of coupling with the host device(1) based on some sort of supply voltage level, data-enable signal or data transfer clock signal output from the host(1) because both systems are related to a power consumption reduction of a display device.

In claim 3, as to the limitation "plurality of display devices interconnected to one another and each display monitors the state of coupling....", such is also shown to be old by Solhjell et al(see figure 2).

In claims 6-7, as to the limitation "the state of coupling the with host is constantly monitored", such is also the case in the system of Solhjell et al so long as the computer is on and active(Abstract).

In claims 8-9, as to the limitations "the state of coupling with the host is monitored during s period which is set by means of a timer", such is also the case in Solhjel et al(timing control 5).

In claims 13-18, relative to the limitations "when the coupling with host is cancelled each display device independently administers power management thereof....", again such is taught by the system of Solhjell et al(column 4, lines 10-29).

In claim 19, as to the limitation "liquid crystal display", while the display(3) of Solhjell et al is a CRT, but Ando teaches the concept of using LCD(503-504) with power saving feature based of some sort of signal outputted by the CPU(11, see figure 2). Therefor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Solhjell et al with the noted teaching of Ando such that to substitute the CRT display(3) with an LCD because both systems are related to power consumption reduction and further because all display devices are alternative equivalent of each other wherein substitution of one for another types is well within the realm of one of ordinary skill in the art.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Mirov et al and Nagae et al are made of record to show further examples of display systems with power saving features.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Fatahiyar whose telephone number is (571)272-7688. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard, can be reached on 571-272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Fatahiyar *MF*

June 10, 2005

*Xiao Wu*  
**XIAO WU**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**